REMARKS

Claims 1-15 are pending in the present application. By this Response, claims 1-4, 6-9 and 11-14 are amended. Claims 1 is amended to recite "A method in a data processing system for processing perspective corrected texture coordinates, comprising the steps of: identifying texture coordinates at each of four adjacent pixels, performing a calculation to identify a difference between the texture coordinates, identifying a perspective correction factor based on perspective correction coordinates, generating partial differential equations by multiplying each texture coordinate difference by the perspective correction factor, and using the partial differential equations to render an image, wherein the rendered image is displayed on a display device." Claims 6 and 11 are similarly amended. Support for these amendments may be found at least on page 8, lines 18-17 and page 1, line 25 to page 2, line 2. Claims 2-4, 7-9 and 12-14 are amended in view of the amendments to independent claims 1, 6 and 11. Reconsideration of the claims in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

I. 35 U.S.C. § 101

The Office Action rejects claims 1-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to "generating partial differential equations." See Office Action, dated May 24, 2004. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

35 U.S.C. § 101, as quoted in the Office Action, reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claim 1 reads as follows:

> 1. A method in a data processing system for processing perspective corrected texture coordinates, comprising the steps of:
>
> a) identifying texture coordinates at each of four adjacent pixels;

b) performing a calculation to identify a difference between the texture coordinates;

c) identifying a perspective correction factor based on perspective correction coordinates;

d) generating partial differential equations by multiplying each texture coordinate difference by the perspective correction factor;

wherein steps a) through d) include sharing data from each of the four adjacent pixels; and

e) using the partial differential equations to render an image, wherein the rendered image is displayed on a display device.

In this case, the claimed method could only be held non-statutory if it consists solely of mathematical operations without some claimed practical application. *In re Meyer*, 688 F.2d 789, 794-95, 215 USPQ 193, 197 (CCPA 1982). The claim recites, "using the partial differential equations to render an image, wherein the rendered image is displayed on a display device." Independent claim 11 is recites similar subject matter to that of claim 1. Furthermore, the system of claim 11 cannot be interpreted to be merely an algorithm.

Claim 6 reads as follows:

6. A computer program product in a computer readable medium for use in a data processing system, for processing perspective corrected texture coordinates, the computer program product comprising:

a) first instructions for identifying texture coordinates at each of four adjacent pixels;

b) second instructions for performing a calculation to identify a difference between the texture coordinates;

c) third instructions for identifying a perspective correction factor based on perspective correction coordinates;

d) fourth instructions for generating partial differential equations by multiplying each texture coordinate difference by the perspective correction factor;

wherein instructions a) through d) further include instructions for sharing data from each of the four adjacent pixels; and

e) fifth instructions for using the partial differential equations to render and image, wherein the rendered image is displayed on a display device.

The invention defined in these claims is a computer program product on a computer-readable medium for processing perspective corrected texture coordinates. In determining whether a claimed invention is statutory or non-statutory, a decision must be made as to whether the claimed invention is functional descriptive material, non-

functional descriptive material of a natural phenomenon. When functional descriptive material is recorded on some computer-readable medium, it becomes structurally and functionally interrelated to the medium and will be statutory in most cases. See *In re Brana*, 51 F.3d at 1564, 34 USPQ2d at 1436; *In re Jolles*, 628 F.2d 1322, 1326 n.10, 206 USPQ 885, 889 n.11 (CCPA 1980); *In re Fouche*, 439 F.2d 1237, 1243, 169 USPQ 429, 434 (CCPA 1971). Also, the present invention does not qualify as non-functional descriptive material of a natural phenomenon.

As a computer program product, the present invention may be evaluated as a series of steps to be performed on a computer. In this case, the claimed computer-related program product could only be held non-statutory if it consists solely of mathematical operations without some claimed practical application. *In re Meyer*, 688 F.2d 789, 794-95, 215 USPQ 193, 197 (CCPA 1982). The claim recites, "using the partial differential equations to render an image, whereon the rendered image is displayed on a display device." Therefore, claims 1-15 are statutory and the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 101 is overcome.

II. Conclusion

It is respectfully urged that the subject application is patentable over the prior art of record and is now in condition for allowance. The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number if in the opinion of the Examiner such a telephone conference would expedite or aid the prosecution and examination of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

DATE: August 24, 2004

Francis Lammes

Francis Lammes
Reg. No. 55,353
Yee & Associates, P.C.
P.O. Box 802333
Dallas, TX 75380
(972) 367-2001
Agent for Applicant